

Date: Tue, 27 Sep 94 04:30:18 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #465
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 27 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 465

Today's Topics:

 More complete, interesting data
 Question about PRB-1 and antenna restrictions
 Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 26 Sep 1994 19:07:05 GMT
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!
usenet@ames.arpa
Subject: More complete, interesting data
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I wrote a little shell script with awk, grep and wc to sift through all
the articles from rec.radio.amateur.policy on my local server, and this
is a complete list of the results.

The authors are based on addresses appearing in the "From:" lines.
I used the username portion (from user@domain) to search, then listed
all the complete addresses which a user appears in. It looks pretty
consistent (i.e., no user seems to appear to be in more than one
domain).

Total articles: 178
Total authors: 62
First article date: 9/19/94

23 dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)
14 gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
14 Ed Eilers <edellers@delphi.com>
13 jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
11 wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner)
8 md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan)
6 myers@Cypress.West.Sun.Com (Dana Myers), myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers)
6 little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little), little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little)
5 mancini@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (Dr. Michael Mancini)
5 flaherty@pa.dec.com (Paul Flaherty)
4 dave@eram.esi.com.au (Dave Horsfall)
3 wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX)
3 rheiss@harp.aix.calpoly.edu (Robert Everitt Heiss)
3 gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown)
3 brunelli_pc@delphi.com
3 Larry.Roll@ssalpha.com (Larry Roll)
3 Earl=Morse%EMC=Srv%Eng=Hou@bangate.compaq.com
2 rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri)
2 rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister)
2 kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com>
2 barron@rmc.liant.com (Robert Barron)
2 William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.rockwell.COM
2 Tony Stalls <rstalls@access4.digex.net>
2 Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com
1 zlau@arrl.org (Zack Lau (KH6CP))
1 wylz@bach.coe.neu.edu (Scott Ehrlich)
1 wps@ElSegundoCA.NCR.COM (Bill Starkgraf)
1 willbode@village.CA (William Bode)
1 swider@washpenn.UUCP (Rob Swider)
1 steview@sheridan.ncd.com (Steve Wilson)
1 sailou@aol.com (Sailou)
1 s2202629@np.ac.sg (Teh Aik Wen)
1 rsnyder@astro.ge.com (Bob Snyder)
1 pwalker@mbi.moody.edu (Paul D. Walker II)
1 pat.wilson@pplace.com (Pat Wilson)
1 nsayer@quack.kfu.com (Nick Sayer)
1 niles.stacey@infoway.com (Niles Stacey)
1 n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com (Stan Olochowski N2AYJ)
1 mtracy@arrl.org (Mike Tracy (KC1SX))
1 mtracy@arrl.org (Mike Tracy (KC1SX))
1 mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
1 mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn)
1 levin@bbn.com (Joel B Levin)
1 lenwink@indirect.com (Len Winkler)
1 lakeith@robins.af.mil (Larry CONTRACTOR Keith Mr.)
1 jtomason@li.net (Joe Tomasone)
1 jmollan@egreen.iclnet.org (John Mollan - Harm)

1 jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard)
1 jchandle@netcom.com (James W Chandler III)
1 jangus@skyld.grendel.com (Jeffrey D. Angus)
1 haynes@cats.ucsc.edu (James H. Haynes)
1 ham@wam.umd.edu (Scott Richard Rosenfeld)
1 etuggle@auc.trw.com (Eddie D. Tuggle)
1 dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (David Tiller)
1 croaker@access.digex.net (Francis A. Ney, Jr.)
1 chuckb@tc.fluke.COM (Chuck Bowden)
1 brettb@cruzio.com
1 billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake)
1 au831@freenet.buffalo.edu (James B. Laughlan Jr)
1 a001361t@bcfreenet.seflin.lib.fl.us (Kenneth Wimmers)
1 Mike Lyon <mlyon@rahul.net>
1 Hardwick@ix.netcom.com (John Hardwick)

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
*
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
*
* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?" *

Date: 26 Sep 1994 19:58:47 GMT
From: newsgw.mentorg.com!wv.mentorg.com!philip@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Question about PRB-1 and antenna restrictions
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Sep22.161730.7177@auc.trw.com>, etuggle@auc.trw.com (Eddie D. Tuggle) writes:

|>
|> Does PRB-1 only apply to local government. Does it have any jurisdiction
|> over CC&Rs? I live in a VERY restrictive area. Antennas are not allowed,
|> dishes in the back yard are not allowed, towers are definitely not allowed!!
|>
|> Is there anything I can do to change this? Do I have any rights to put up an
|> antenna/tower? I'm willing to put up a crank-up tower and keep it down when
|> not in use. I'd only require ~40-50 ft tower.
|>
|> It seems like there is no place you can buy a house that will allow antennas
|> anymore.

For this very reason, the ARRL is currently discussing the matter with the FCC (or so I understand). The FCC excluded CC&Rs on the basis that they are

voluntary. Well, as you say, reality is something else.

What can you do ?

- * Petition the neighbours to see if there is any strong and widespread opposition to changing the CC&Rs. If not, persuade a number of followers to go to a meeting, and vote in the change.
- * Get yourself, and a few like-thinkers elected to the "architectural committee" - these people are the arbiters of good tastes, and can usually grant waivers ...
- * Read the CC&Rs CAREFULLY.
In a previous life, I lived on an estate in France which had very strong rules about external antennas. this was extended to cover satellite dishes. Some careful reading showed that they had screwed themselves, it was VERY specific about mounting any sort of antenna on the roof or walls. It said NOTHING about putting the mast on the patio ...
- * Check the wording to see if it refers only to FIXED structures.
If not, think about a trailer mounted mast. If there is objection to that, you take exception to all of those unsightly radio and cell phone antennas on cars and trucks parked outside people's homes :-)

Philip

Date: 26 Sep 1994 20:51:08 GMT

From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!korie!male.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews1.Eng.Sun.COM!
engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!usenet@ames.arpa

Subject: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Cwnqx5.5KC@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>The digital crowd surely runs full power ignoring the law

This is either unwarranted speculation, ignorance, or malicious lying. Some of the "digital crowd" have gone so far as to automatically reduce power until the error rate goes up.

>They're probably not even listening

>to the frequency they're transmitting on (``Oops - sorry for smashing

>your QSO guys - we keep the volume turned down - can't stand the

>chirping noise.'')

Of course we don't listen to the signal. One of the things that makes digital operation so pleasant is that one doesn't have to listen to all the QRN. This doesn't cause QRM, since we listen *first*. Anyway, CW signals are clearly visible in the tuning indicator LEDs. I'm sure that some people have had their CW QSOs trod on by a digital station starting up, but then I hear CW people tuning up and calling CQ on top of the W1AW code practice transmission almost every night.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: 26 Sep 1994 18:25:09 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!uhog.mit.edu!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!sedona!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <35v30j\$d5u@news.iastate.edu>, <361ro8\$er9@chnews.intel.com>,
<1994Sep26.151608.18667@lpi.liant.com>
Subject : Re: Deaf Ham & CW

In article <1994Sep26.151608.18667@lpi.liant.com>,
Robert Barron <barron@rmc.liant.com> wrote:
>In <361ro8\$er9@chnews.intel.com>, Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.ch.intel.com writes:
>>While receiving, write down the dots and dashes as dots and dashes.
>>The Morse code characters have earlier been memorized... i.e. 'A' is
>>dot-dash, etc. Then, during the multiple choice test, one can take one's
>>time in deciphering the dots and dashes.
>
>Ugh. I think I recall someone doing this for a Novice test that I gave some
>years back. I don't imagine it too effective at 13 and much less so at 20.

I repeat, this was Wayne Green's idea and is not to be used if one ever wants to actually use _manual_ Morse code. If one doesn't care for manual CW, this will allow novices access to HF (10m) SSB.

>Does anyone remember that classic Wayne Green editorial in which he starts off
>saying that CW causes brain disorders...

Obviously, he was kidding although there seem to exist hams whose brains are so occupied with CW processes that there is no room left for rational concepts... akin to the porpoise and its sonar brain function. :-)

--

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC

Most of the doors in amateur radio can

(Not speaking for Intel) not be opened by a -.-. .-- key.

Date: Mon, 26 Sep 1994 12:00:34 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!news.cs.utah.edu!cs.utexas.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!news.sprintlink.net!nwnexus!news.halcyon.com!
pacsci-20.pacsci.org!user@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <555_9409250500@ssalpha.com>, <p8514wr.edellers@delphi.com>,
<366qha\$dgl@jupiter.planet.net>on.a
Subject : Re: Get Over It

billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake) wrote:

> And, as has been pointed out over and over again, this debate/dialog/
> discussion is not on a total elimination of CW testing...it is: Justify
> the need (in the USA) to test at 13wpm for the majority of HF access.
> I think I'm pretty safe in saying that all of us that want to see a more
> reasonable testing scenario (i.e. where 13wpm isn't a pass/fail element)
> have said we would accept the continuation of 5wpm, but we see no
> justification for the 13wpm requirement to gain the majority of HF
> access. And, I think all of us have said we would be favorable
> to a band plan for HF that set aside a special CW only segment on
> every HF band. If you want, subdivide the CW only segment and require
> 13/20wpm certification for use.
> --
> Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)
> Budd Lake, New Jersey

Exactly!

I have been reading this newsgroup for only a couple of days, but am
dissappointed by the flaming going on... I especially take offense at the
messages that denigrate No-Code Techs and/or "appliance operators".

I hold a Technician license, received in 1984. Long before "enhancement",
the only reason I am not a General is because of my lack of ability to
pass the 13. If it were not for the code requirements, I would be an
extra. The written tests are a breeze for me.

I have been trying for 10 years to get up to 13 wpm, with very little
success. You see, I have a definite problem with patterns, very similar
to dyslexia. For example, when I hear a Q, Y, F, or L, I immediately know
that ONE of them was sent, but not WHICH one. However, the way the
Handicapped provision is written, I don't qualify for the waiver.

CW is an extremely difficult mode for me to work with. I get absolutely no enjoyment from it, and don't expect to ever use it in "real life". Why should I? In over 10 years I have YET to see (actually, hear) any instance where code was used except by individuals using it for fun and/or practice traffic. Never in any emergency situations.

As an example, go back to the San Francisco Earthquake a few years ago. At that time I had a complete HF station that could handle 10-160. I even had the PK-232 hooked up to the system (and to a 2m radio for packet). The 232 can decode (and send, too) morse. I spent the first 18 hours or so after the quake at that station, trying to find SOME way to help. I was receiving phone calls from local friends who wondered if I could help getting/sending messages into/out of s.f.... Of course, not having become a general, I could not join all the nets on 20 and 40 PHONE that had popped up to pass traffic. What did I find on CW? Nothing that mattered. The ONLY qso's I found in CW that night that even mentioned the quake did so in passing. No traffic handling at all.

Work 10meter, you say? Yeah, sure. Again, nothing there. All the action was on 20 and 40.

I simply do not understand why I am not allowed to use PHONE on HF when the only barrier is a CODE test. I can do 9wpm; that passes the international requirement (where no actual SPEED is listed!!). I agree with what Bill said above; in essence, make the frigging test MATCH the privilege!

As for the code tests being filters to keep the riff-raff out, that is hogwash. Just look at all the messes on 20m (and elsewhere), not to mention the nasty and hateful messages HERE by (alleged) extras... I would also wager that the majority of hams could not pass their current level of morse if retested today.

And before you start putting me down by calling me a "whiner", just remember that I have >been trying for 10 years< to get up to 13wpm, with no success.

One last thing while I am up on this soapbox:

I qualify as being an appliance operator. At least according to the definitions in this news-group. I currently do not own/use any ham-gear that I built myself. In fact, I only own 1 radio right now. My first radio: a Kenwood 2500 2m handheld. This is not to say that I have never built anything; I have. I have also owned a number of radios and related equipment. I got rid of all my HF stuff after the earthquake (previously mentioned).

I drive a 93 Eagle Vision TSi (Chrysler corp LH platform sedan). It is a

very comfortable, competent vehicle. I am a good mechanic. Over the years I have done major repairs, even re-builds to my vehicles. When the time comes, I will not have a problem doing such to the Eagle. It is probably quite possible that I could assemble a car as complex as the Eagle from parts (not probable, tho), and it is even possible that I could design a passable car (however crude it might be). BUT WHY? Chrysler has already done a >fine< job designing and building the vehicle.

I did not participate in the designing or building of the car. Does that make me a lousy driver? Certainly NOT. I did not design or build the Kenwood 2500. Does that make me a lid? Again, certainly NOT.

Yes, I >do< build electronic items for myself; hifi pieces, some micro-controllers, etc. But why should I re-invent the wheel, so to speak? If ICOM or KENWOOD can build a competent, feature laden radio that I want, why should I be inclined to try and build something similar? It would be a waste of my time!

I am in this hobby to be an amateur radio OPERATOR, not manufacturer.

If >YOU< enjoy building all your own gear, then by all means do so! But please stop denigrating others who are not retired that are more interesting in USING radios as tools to communicate rather than building the tools...

73,
Mitch Robinson, N7GOW

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #465
